

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the preceding amendment and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11 and 14-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 16-21 and 23 are amended. No claims are cancelled or added by this Amendment. Claims 1, 11, 16-19 and 23 are independent claims.

### **Example Embodiments**

Applicants submit the following description of an example embodiment will aid the Examiner in understanding the Applicants' disclosure as well as the various claims of this application. In particular, Applicants would like to direct the Examiner's attention to the example embodiment shown in FIG. 8. FIG. 8 illustrates a cell #1 that references more than one PTMAP. In FIG. 8, cell #1 references a PTMAP and PTMAPI for channel 1 and a PTMAP and PTMAPI for channel 2 as indicated by the dotted lines. Applicants also note that paragraph [0057] describing FIG. 8 states the following.

A piece of CI also of this second embodiment includes a 'field of the number of channels' besides the fields of Fig. 4, and the field group composed of the PTMAP number 'PTMAPN', start PTM of a cell 'C\_V\_S\_PTM', and end PTM of a cell 'C\_V\_E\_PTM' is created as many as the number of digital channels of contained in a recorded stream referred by the piece of CI. In addition, an additional field for writing digital channel numbers is reserved in the piece of CI since *a single piece of CI covers all of digital channels contained in a recorded multi-channel stream*. An additional field for writing digital channel numbers may be allocated in the PGI. (*emphasis added*)

Accordingly, as indicated by the above-quoted paragraph [0057] and FIG. 8, a single piece of cell information CI may cover all of the digital channels contained in a recorded multi-channel

stream. Below Applicants address the specific art rejections and various features of the independent claims believed to distinguish the claims over the cited references.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4, 9, 11 and 14-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0046328) in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,569). Applicants provide the following comments to traverse this rejection.

On page 3, lines 7-11 of the Office Action mailed September 13, 2007, the Examiner acknowledges that claim 1 differs from Okada since Okada fails to disclose the features of the navigation area recited in independent claim 1. The Examiner goes on to assert on page 3, lines 12-20 of the Office Action that Yamamoto discloses the navigation area recited in independent claim 1. In particular, the Examiner cites FIGS. 6-7B; column 12, lines 1-34; and column 15, line 29 to column 16, line 40 of Yamamoto as disclosing the navigation area recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully rebut this assertion as detailed below.

FIG. 6 shows a structure of a program chain PGC 61; FIG 7A discloses information included in a cell; and FIG. 7B shows cell identification information. Further, column 12, lines 1-34 indicates that a reproduction order for each program 60 may be controlled using program chain information PGCI and that an author may select a reproduction method from one of the following: (i) random reproduction, (ii) shuffle reproduction, (iii) loop reproduction and (iv) combination of loop reproduction with the random reproduction or the shuffle reproduction. Still further, column 15, line 29 to column 16, line 40 of Yamamoto describes FIGs. 6-7B. However, none of these cited portions of Yamamoto disclose, teach or suggest *a map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths* and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce, *much less a navigation data item referencing more than one*

*map.* At most, the cited sections merely describe a relationship between a program chain PGC 61, programs 60, and cells 20. There is no disclosure of a map, or one of the program chain PGC 61, programs 60, or cells 20 referencing more than one map.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 is allowable over the cited references at least because both Okada and Yamamoto fail to disclose, teach or suggest “*at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths* and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce,” which is recited in each of independent claim 1. Independent claims 11, 16-19 and 23 include similar features to independent claim 1 and thus, are believed to be allowable over Okada and Yamamoto for similar reasons.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 16-20 and 23, as well as claims 2-4, 9, 14, 15, 20, 21 and 24-38 depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

#### **Request for Interview**

Should the Examiner determine the above arguments do not overcome the rejections, Applicants request the Examiner contact Applicants’ representative at the telephone number below so that an interview can be scheduled to provide the Applicants with an increased understanding of the Examiner’s position and to allow Applicants’ representative to further explain the Applicants position. The requested interview will allow the Applicants to determine whether further claim amendments may be helpful or if an Appeal is the appropriate course of action.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims pending in this application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott A. Elchert at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

 55,149

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

Scott A. Elchert, Reg. No. 55,149

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/SAE/ame